

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, DC

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING
HELD ON NOVEMBER 11, 2016
AT 1957 E STREET NW, STATE ROOM

Present: President Knapp, Provost Maltzman, Registrar Amundson, and Parliamentary Charnovitz; Deans Feuer and Goldman; Executive Committee Chair Garris; Professors Agnew, Cline, Cordes, Corry, Cottrol, Downes, Griesshammer, Khoury, Lewis, Markus, McHugh, Newcomer, Parsons, Pintz, Price, Pulcini, Rice, Roddis, Sarkar, Sidawy, Watkins, Wilmarth, Wilson, and Wirtz.

Absent: Deans Akman, Brigety, Dolling, Eskandarian, Jeffries, Livingstone, Morant, and Vinson; Professors Briscoe, Costello, Galston, Griffin, Harrington, Hawley, Hopkins, Jacobson, Kohn, McDonnell, Packer, Perry, Rehman, Rohrbeck, and Zeman.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 2:15 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the October 14, 2016, Faculty Senate meeting were approved unanimously without comment.

REPORT: PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH UPDATE (Board of Trustees Chair Nelson Carbonell)

Chair Carbonell began his remarks by acknowledging the veterans who are part of the GW community on this Veterans Day. He then expressed his thanks to President Knapp for his years of service to the university and for his gift of time in announcing his departure as it allows for a deliberate and careful search process.

Chair Carbonell proceeded to discuss the presidential search process, which is occurring in three main phases:

1. Building a profile for the candidate and for the search firm. Chair Carbonell noted that he attended over thirty town hall meetings and faculty meetings and also met with the city council and the mayor to discuss what the position profile should include. He noted that Trustee Madeleine Jacobs, who is chairing the Presidential Search Committee (PSC), has been incredibly diligent about this outreach process as well. The profile has now been defined and is available at <http://www.presidentialsearch.gwu.edu>.

In addition, potential interview questions have been solicited from all those participating in the outreach efforts. These questions will not be made public as the committee would prefer that the candidates answer spontaneously. Chair Carbonell expressed his thanks to the entire community for its engagement in this process.

2. Nominations. Thus far, the committee has received well over one hundred nominations, most of which are very serious. The nominees range from sitting administrators at other institutions to people who have had illustrious academic careers to people who have spent time in government and industry. The pool is also very diverse, which is something the committee sought from the outset. Chair Carbonell noted that the PSC's selection of Isaacson, Miller as the search firm for this process was driven in part by their track record of being able to build very diverse candidate pools.

Chair Carbonell stated that the nomination window will close when a hire is made. Past experience has shown that late-emerging candidates have sometimes turned out to be the best person for the position. He therefore asked that faculty—especially, given their unique positioning to have contacts at other institutions—continue to drive nominations to the PSC.

3. Selection process. The selection process is described in two university governance documents: the bylaws (available at <https://trustees.gwu.edu/governing-documents>) and the Faculty Code. The bylaws state that the Board of Trustees must elect the president, with the full board voting. The Faculty Code mentions the presidential search process in two places: first, stating that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) consults with the Board on the selection of any senior academic positions; and second, stating that a Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) will be elected to advise the Board on the search. The FCC was elected in two parts, involving a special Faculty Assembly in September. The PSC has now met with both the FSEC and the FCC twice, and both groups will consult with the Board during the selection process.

Chair Carbonell noted that the selection process is confidential in that the PSC will maintain the confidentiality of the candidates. The primary reason for this—and a positive—is to maintain a strong pool that includes candidates who would not want their names published before knowing they had been selected for the position. The downside is that only the PSC will know the identities of candidates prior to their making a recommendation of two or more finalists to the Board. Broadening the group who know candidates' identities through the use confidentiality agreements gives GW personnel confidence in the confidentiality of the process, but external candidates would be hard-pressed to believe that, in a large group, no-one would leak a name. As the search nears the finalist recommendation stage (and as the Board then needs to consult closely with the FSEC and the FCC regarding a final decision), the confidentiality question will be revisited depending on the requirements of the individual finalists.

Chair Carbonell spoke briefly about the timing of the process, noting that the PSC is currently in the middle of the nominating process. His expectation is that, early in 2017, the PSC will be in a position to move final candidates forward to the Board. This timeline is subject to acceleration, depending on the outcome of the nomination and interview process.

Professor Wilmarth noted that some candidates will come to the process with their own ideas about new approaches they would bring to GW, while the Board will—to some extent—have its own plan and vision for GW. He asked whether the Board is seeking a visionary, transformational candidate or a candidate who will most effectively manage a vision that has already been laid out for the

university. Chair Carbonell responded that the primary objective is to hire someone who really wants to and can lead the university in the direction that has been collectively discussed; the profile development process entailed spending two to three months working as a community to define where GW wants to go, what its challenges and opportunities are, and what the best characteristics of a leader would be.

He recalled that the search that brought President Knapp to GW involved finding someone who could energize the academic enterprise (both research and teaching), raise philanthropic dollars, and knit GW's relationship with the community, which had become a little frayed at that point. President Knapp was the best fit for those priorities, given his experience at Johns Hopkins. Going forward, many of the same priorities are in place. The environment in which a new president will operate will be more challenging from a financial standpoint. Chair Carbonell noted that the Board is certainly interested in a candidate with vision and ideas. A new president would not be pinned to doing a short list of specific things, but Chair Carbonell expressed his sense that the Board would lean toward someone who will lead GW where GW has stated it wants to go.

Professor Griesshammer asked about how a new president can further research. He noted that one simplistic way of measuring research productivity is by simply looking at dollar amounts. This occurs a lot at GW now, but he noted a complementary piece of the research picture that is difficult to fit into dollars but does translate into reputation and visibility for the university. A researcher receiving a Fulbright or a Guggenheim fellowship, or finding a long-lost manuscript of an eminent author, does not necessarily add anything to the research expenditure count but brings positive media attention to the university, which in turn can attract stronger students. Professor Griesshammer wondered how the search process can help ensure that a new president will look beyond research expenditures to this less tangible but no less important quality.

Chair Carbonell responded that the next president has to see the academic community more broadly than just through research dollars from major government funding agencies. He noted that the university has done a pretty good job of this thus far but can always create a better environment for researchers in this regard. He indicated that questions for candidates centered on research will speak to Professor Griesshammer's point—specifically, how broadly does the candidate think about research and ensuring that researchers from all disciplines have opportunities to undertake and publish their work.

President Knapp added that next week he will visit four foundations that are instrumental in supporting projects in the social sciences, humanities, and the arts. These visits are meant to thank these institutions for their support but also to ensure that these opportunities are kept open. He further noted that the university celebrates major fellowships such as those mentioned by Professor Griesshammer through media exposure. In addition, he confirmed that Vice President Chalupa invests his own departmental funds in research subsidies for humanities and social science projects that don't typically have opportunities for federal funding.

Chair Carbonell added that one of the things that makes the GW presidency a terrific opportunity is the fact that GW is a comprehensive institution. Because GW has disciplines ranging from medicine to law to engineering to political science to international affairs and beyond, it has a balanced portfolio in terms of the types of faculty and students it can attract. It also speaks to long-term viability as students arriving in ten years may be interested in different fields than students arriving today; GW's comprehensive nature will allow it to remain relevant as interests change.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

None.

GENERAL BUSINESS

- I. Faculty Assembly Update
Executive Committee Chair Garris reported that the annual Faculty Assembly was held on October 25, 2016. Resolution FA 17/3 was passed at the Assembly. This resolution makes an exception for the School of Medicine and Health Sciences (SMHS) and the School of Nursing (SON) to the tenure requirements for Senate election. Eligibility was expanded for these two schools to regular, non-tenured faculty with a minimum of three years of full-time service subject to the limitation that at least half of the Senate members from each of the two schools be tenured. The exemption for SON will expire in three years. The resolution originated from Senate Resolution 16/6.
- II. Nominations for election of new members to Senate Standing Committees:
A student representative, Student Association Executive Vice President Thomas Falcigno, was presented and approved for Educational Policy.
- III. Benefits Advisory Committee faculty election:
Please reference the attached remarks by Executive Committee Chair Garris regarding the revised Benefits Advisory Committee faculty slate presented to the Senate today. The revised slate was approved unanimously.
- IV. Reports of Senate Standing Committees:
None.
- V. Report of the Executive Committee: Professor C.A. Garris, Chair:
Please see the attached report of the Executive Committee presented by Professor Garris.
- VI. Provost's Remarks:
Provost Maltzman addressed several items:
 1. Syllabus development. Faculty will receive an email encouraging them to keep in mind the cost of materials. The University Librarian's staff will be assisting faculty in identifying open access materials that might be useful in place of more expensive materials. Small reductions in each of our course materials' costs will have significant impacts across the student body as a whole.
 2. Milo Yiannopoulos speech. Mr. Yiannopoulos gave a speech at GW last month, and many were concerned about his presence on campus as he is a fairly controversial speaker. The Provost noted his feeling that it is important that the university remain committed to academic freedom and use these speakers as teaching moments.

3. Dean reviews. Vice Provost Christopher Bracey is assembling a faculty committee to assist in the development of a process for the review of deans. He urged senators to volunteer for this committee either via their respective schools' deans' councils (if they exist) or by contacting Vice Provost Bracey directly.
4. Election. Provost Maltzman indicated that he has met with students and has heard from both students and faculty in the wake of this week's presidential election. Some students do feel extremely vulnerable, and it is important that these feelings are acknowledged. As President Knapp affirmed in his statement, the university has at its core a commitment to diversity. Vice Provost Laguerre-Brown posted resources on her website for students feeling in need of support. Provost Maltzman also noted that it is a tribute to GW's faculty that, in a number of classes, healthy and appropriate discussions about the election took place, allowing students to safely express their concerns.
5. Basketball season. Both the women's and men's basketball teams begin their seasons this evening. The women are playing at Georgetown, and the men's game will be preceded by the presentation of the NIT championship rings and banner.

VII. Chair's Remarks:

President Knapp noted that Alumni Weekend was held two weeks ago, with the best attendance on record. He noted that alumni are engaging in ways beyond the philanthropic; they are serving as mentors, career advisors, etc. and becoming more engaged with current students. Programs within the alumni organizations have also been diversified to reflect the many communities from which GW students are drawn. One of the ways GW makes history is through its students, who become active alumni (now numbering more than 275,000) around the world.

The Distinguished Alumni Achievement Award is presented in the fall and the Alumni Service Award in the spring, providing two opportunities annually to celebrate alumni. Alumni Weekend also included a very interesting panel on the election, moderated by Frank Sesno. This was the culminating event of Alumni Weekend; a number of faculty participated (from the School of Media and Public Affairs and the Graduate School of Political Management) as well as some distinguished alumni.

President Knapp also addressed the election, reading his brief statement of Wednesday evening. The statement was triggered by concerns from students who worried that there might be less than civil exchanges of opinion on campus. The statement is as follows:

"A hallmark of our community is the civil discourse that takes place on our campuses every day. Our students, repeatedly ranked the most politically active in the country, set a national example in their ability to disagree passionately but without rancor. As we watch our democracy proceed with its peaceful transition of power, I urge our students and all members of our community to continue to respect our differences, maintain civility and celebrate our diversity."

President Knapp noted that students expressed appreciation for the support they receive as they continue to engage politically. He commented that GW is ranked year after year as the most politically active student body in the country, which often seems to be misunderstood as an indication that GW students are engaged in demonstrations. This is certainly occasionally true. However, students are politically engaged in the sense that they want to be involved in the political process. They want to make a difference and make history, and they want to do this by engaging in an extraordinary range of ways on all sides of every issue.

BRIEF STATEMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Professor Griesshammer reported that the Division of IT (DIT) is shutting down the personal web spaces of faculty members. They have offered that faculty members with these spaces can rekey them into Wordpress but that the home.gwu.edu spaces will be entirely removed by the end of December 2016. Professor Griesshammer noted his issue with this. Many of these sites are not a simple photo and bio but rather include significant databases, conference websites, and at times information that is mandated by federal funding agencies. DIT has indicated that there will not be any assistance with the migration of these sites.

Professor Griesshammer expressed his shock at this, in part due to the likely consequence that individual departments will again create their own web presences, which was heavily discouraged years ago due to security risks. Individual departments are not, however, receiving any assistance with site migration. Instead, DIT is apparently in conversation with the IT offices within the schools to assist with the migration of school-level sites.

This transition will also require funding, and this task seems to represent another task being delegated away from the central administration to the schools without an appropriate parallel funding structure. He asked for thoughts on what could be done to alleviate this problem, noting that this is now the third time DIT has attempted to remove these sites.

Professor Wirtz put the immediate question in a broader context. The Educational Policy committee recently heard concerns about a more general issue: the effect of cutbacks in DIT on faculty and lab- and medical-related matters. He paraphrased CIO Steinour's remarks, which focused on the continuing nature of cuts within DIT and DIT's efforts to avoid these cuts impacting the faculty in a severe way. However, the current trajectory would indicate that faculty will indeed be impacted negatively. He noted that the Educational Policy committee expressed to CIO Steinour that there needs to be a mechanism for discussions ongoing within the administration regarding cuts that will impact the ability of faculty to operate effectively.

Provost Maltzman indicated that he would look into this concern. He noted that it is important to recognize that GW is trying to address issues of affordability as well as general stresses in the higher education environment. These cuts will inevitably have some impact on faculty; no one at the university will be completely immune to budget cuts. He noted, though, that he agreed with Professor Wirtz that consultation with faculty should be incorporated into the process.

President Knapp addressed the 3-5% budget cuts over successive years, which have been announced publicly on multiple occasions. Two factors are driving the need to reduce central administration

expenses. One is the budget model, which transferred control over future tuition revenue growth substantially to the schools. Revenue that used to be collected centrally is now being captured in the schools as a deliberate move in the direction of decentralizing the university structure in order to increase the flexibility and the strategic agility of the deans. This was developed with the deans over a time with a great deal of discussion.

The second factor is the shrinking availability of net tuition revenue as a result of the fact that costs have been rising faster than the ability of families to pay those costs. The financial aid budget has therefore continued to rise. Solving this issue involves reducing expenses or bringing in new sources of revenue. This is being done in many areas, but the benefits are limited, as new tuition-generating programs require expenses of their own.

Professor Wirtz noted that the faculty recognizes the exigencies that have put the university in this position. He expressed his hope that the administration recognizes that students and the community at large are expecting the faculty and the university to do its job as educators. Faculty need to be involved in the conversation when key components of that job (that will negatively impact the ability of the faculty to perform its function) are being discussed even as possibilities for elimination.

President Knapp noted his complete agreement with this statement. He stated that his repeated message to his senior staff throughout this process has been that the university doesn't want to do anything that is counterproductive and makes it more difficult for GW to generate the revenues it needs to conduct its mission of education, research, and service.

Professor Griesshammer expressed his confusion at President Knapp's statement on budget cuts, as he took away from the Provost's presentation on the new budget model at the last Senate meeting that the transition from the old to the new budget model was designed to be budget neutral and not to involve spending the same tuition dollar twice. This specific point had been clarified in the Q&A part of the Provost's presentation. This would mean that whenever responsibilities are transferred from the central administration to the schools, the necessary resources must be provided as well, at a commensurate level. He noted that after two years of 5% cuts, it is time to stop using a hatchet for further cuts across the board, but turn to the lancet for surgical incisions. Some areas (such as the libraries) are being disproportionately affected by these cuts, and administrative units that were thrifty with their budgets are now feeling the cuts more keenly than those that spent freely and can cut expenses more readily.

President Knapp reiterated that revenues can't be spent twice—if there is less money to spend on central functions, then there must be a reduction in or reorganization of those central functions. The Provost added that the 5% cut is not being applied uniformly across the board. Different units are also timing their cuts at different paces depending upon the nature of their organization's operations. The library's cuts appeared more extreme because library leadership opted to identify the full slate of cuts up-front rather than make decisions about them each year. However, the cut is not always 5% uniformly across the board. He gave the example of the University Counseling Center and of financial aid, which have a clear demand and importance to the university's mission.

Professor Roddis noted that there appears to be a disconnect between the intent of the administration in reallocating resources and what is actually happening in the schools, where resource allocation decisions are being made by the deans with no requirement to consult with the faculty prior to doing so.

Professor Roddis continued with a positive comment regarding the new class of first-year students in the School of Engineering and Applied Science. She noted that the class is much more diverse socially, economically, and racially. She credited President Knapp's leadership on student scholarships and diversity for this success. She also expressed her happiness that these students' scholarships are no longer tied to their majoring in engineering; they are free to pursue their academic desires without fear of losing their scholarships.

Professor Wilson asked what implications the outcome of the election has on GW's strategic planning internationally in terms of reassuring students, faculty, and colleagues overseas. Provost Maltzman noted that some of GW's underrepresented populations are feeling different levels of vulnerability about many things. At this point, the administration is simply watching the situation closely and trying to steer students and faculty toward the resources they need.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:23 pm.

BENEFITS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BAC)

Introduction of Slate by C. A. Garris November 11, 2016

1. At the Faculty Senate meeting of October 14, a slate of faculty candidates for the BAC was offered by the Executive Committee. At that time, we obtained agreement from the administration that the BAC would consist of five faculty and five staff plus one non-voting alternate faculty member. Three of the appointees were ex-officio: Chair of FP&B, Chair of ASPP, and an Executive Committee representative. At the Senate meeting, concerns were expressed that three members of the committee came from one school and that the ASPP committee did not fully engage in the process of recommending candidates. A motion was made to recommit the slate to the Executive Committee with the explicit instruction to broaden the representation of the membership and to allow ASPP time to permit fuller discussion. At the Senate meeting, a suggestion was also made that the BAC be expanded from five faculty and five staff to six faculty and six staff, although Deputy VP& Treasurer Ann McCorvey expressed reservations on further enlargement of the committee.
2. The Executive Committee then engaged with ASPP who supported the expansion of the BAC to six faculty, including 3 at-large members and suggested two at-large members from different schools. The need for the alternate member was not advocated. These recommendations were passed to the Executive Committee.
3. The Executive Committee recommended a third at-large member from MISPH with health policy experience replace the alternate in the original slate.
4. The Executive Committee requested that the administration accept these changes including enlarging the BAC. The administration agreed but indicated that it wished to add a 13th member to the BAC from among the **residents** of SMHS, which HR considers a different constituency from faculty and staff.
5. I would like to remind you that the “election” of BAC members differs from the election of Senate standing committee members. Since BAC is an administrative committee, NOT a Senate committee, a Senate election has no explicit basis in any university governance document. In many administrative committees, Senate endorsement of faculty members is NOT sought. There are many examples. However, the Executive Committee is introducing this slate for a Senate vote for two reasons:
 - The administration wishes to consider faculty on this committee as being representatives of the faculty. It is therefore appropriate that the Senate show that we indeed agree that these are our faculty representatives.
 - Faculty members on this committee should know that we, the Senate, support them in their efforts in our behalf. For those faculty participating, please keep in mind that membership in this committee involves an intensive training program, long monthly meetings, lots of difficult discussions, plus a 2-year commitment, and very few expressions of appreciation. So let’s give our support for these fine, dedicated faculty who have agreed to this very important but arduous service for us. On behalf of the Executive Committee, I hereby nominate the list of candidates provided in the agenda.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Charles A. Garris, Chair

November 11, 2016

ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

1. PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH

On October 28, Board Chair Nelson Carbonell met with the Executive Committee to discuss the progress of the Presidential search and to seek input. In particular, he discussed in general the results of all of the town hall meetings. This input was very useful for developing a list of important interview questions to pose to prospective candidates. The Executive Committee was given the opportunity of providing such interview questions and discussing the interview with Chair Carbonell. Chair Carbonell also conducted a similar meeting with the Faculty Consultative Committee.

2. FACULTY ASSEMBLY

On October 25, we held the annual General meeting of the Faculty Assembly. At that meeting, the Faculty Assembly passed Resolution FA 17/3 which made an exception for SMHS and SON by expanding eligibility for membership in the Faculty Senate to regular non-tenured faculty having a minimum of 3-years full-time service, subject to the limitation that at least half of the Faculty Senate members from each of those schools be tenured. This resolution originated from the Faculty Senate's resolution 16/6 which was voted on and passed by a large majority. The exemption for SON will expire in 3 years. We look forward to welcoming the new Senate members who may be elected in the spring.

3. REVIEW OF SCHOOL RULES AND REGULATIONS (BY-LAWS)

In accordance with the revisions in the *Faculty Code*, the By-Laws of all schools are being revised to assure compliance. The process seems to be moving along well and the hope is to finalize it by the end of the Spring semester.

4. COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF DEANS

- The Faculty Code as revised in June 2015 has a new section "C.2(b)(ii) Continuance" under procedures that states "The Provost shall also periodically initiate a comprehensive review of each dean that systematically solicits input from the school's constituents, including, but not limited, to faculty, senior staff of the school, alumni and students." It states that this comprehensive review occur at least every three years. It further requires that the "The Provost shall provide the school's full time faculty a summary of the general conclusion of the review with respect to the *established criteria of the dean's performance*. **The details of the final evaluation shall be conveyed ONLY to the Dean, Provost, President, and the Board of Trustees.**" It further states that the process for the comprehensive review be established by the **Provost**, and that it shall generally be consistent across schools, subject to adjustment for the differing conditions of each school.
- The Executive Committee inquired of the Provost how this new provision of the Faculty Code was being implemented.
 - We understand that the Provost has created an administrative committee to provide recommendations on the process.

- The required faculty participation will probably consist of the Provost sending a questionnaire to a selected group of faculty in each school. The question arose as to which group of faculty in each school would respond to the questionnaire. This may vary from school to school. One clear point, however, was that it may be desirable to include in the bylaws of each school which group of faculty is designated with this task. For example, it could be the “dean’s counsel”, the “department chairs”, special committee elected by the faculty.
- Also, in order to follow the requirements of the Faculty Code’s provisions, the faculty must be apprised of “*the established criteria of the dean’s performance.*”

5. FACULTY CODE GLITCH LIST

As we review the school by-laws, deal with tenure and promotion cases including nonconcurrences, dean searches, and the like, deficiencies in the language of the Faculty Code may become apparent and these deficiencies will find their way on our “Glitch List” which will probably be presented to the Faculty Senate in the form of a resolution in the spring after we deal with school bylaws. New glitches (or tweaks) are emerging and being discussed. PEAf has been working diligently on this. Some of the glitches are minor technical issues and may be consolidated into a single resolution. Some of the other glitches may require debate in the Senate and treated as separate resolutions. There will be much more to be said about this in future Senate meetings.

6. BENEFITS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BAC)

- At the Faculty Senate meeting of October 14, a slate of faculty candidates for the BAC was offered by the Executive Committee. At that time, we obtained agreement from the administration that the BAC would consist of five faculty and five staff plus one non-voting alternate faculty member. Three of the appointees were ex-officio: Chair of FP&B, Chair of ASPP, and an Executive Committee representative. Concerns were expressed that three members of the committee came from one school and that the ASPP committee did not fully engage in the process of recommending candidates. A motion was made to recommit the slate to the Executive Committee with the explicit instruction to broaden the representation of the membership and to allow ASPP time to permit fuller discussion. A suggestion was also made that the BAC be expanded from five faculty and five staff to six faculty and six staff.
- The Executive Committee then engaged with ASPP who supported the expansion of the BAC to six faculty, including 3 at-large members and suggested two at-large members from different schools. The need for the alternate became moot.
- The Executive Committee recommended a third at-large member from GWSPH with health policy experience replace the alternate in the original slate.
- The Executive Committee requested that the administration accept these changes including enlarging the BAC. The administration agreed but indicated that it wished to add a 13th member to the BAC from among the **residents** of SMHS, which HR considers a different constituency from faculty and staff.
- This slate was presented earlier in this meeting for Senate consideration and was accepted.
- On behalf of the Executive Committee, I would like to profusely thank Professors Murli Gupta and Ellen Kurtzman for their willingness to serve on this demanding committee.
- I would like to personally apologize for my own effort to expedite ASPP’s input for the two at-large members to occur within a 1½ week time frame. This clearly created the

embarrassing need to reconfigure the committee and required the unfortunate task of asking two valuable and dedicated faculty to step aside after offering their service.

FACULTY PERSONNEL MATTERS

7. NONCONCURRENCES

A new nonconcurrency emerged from SEAS involving a tenure decision.

8. GRIEVANCES

There are two active grievances: The grievance from GSEHD continues under mediation, while the grievance from GWSB has failed mediation and will move on to the formal hearing stage.

ANY OTHER MATTERS

None

ANNOUNCEMENTS

9. The next meeting of the Executive Committee is on November 18, 2016. Please submit any reports and drafts of resolutions to the committee as quickly as possible and not later than Tuesday, November 15. Today marks the usual one-week notification deadline. However, the meeting is being held earlier in the month than usual due to the upcoming Thanksgiving holiday.

10. The following are some tentative upcoming agenda items:

December 9, 2016

- Report of the Faculty Senate Committee on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting – Prof. Cordes
- Report on Admissions and Retention – Vice Provost for Enrollment Management and Retention Laurie Koehler

January 13, 2017

- Report on the School of Nursing – Dean Pamela Jeffries
- Presidential Search Update: Chair Nelson Carbonell
- Annual Report on Research – VP Leo Chalupa

February 10, 2017

- Report on the Corcoran School for Arts and Design– Director Sanjit Sethi

Thank you.